



Complete Summary

TITLE

Coronary artery disease: coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) area rate.

SOURCE(S)

AHRO quality indicators. Guide to inpatient quality indicators: quality of care in hospitals -- volume, mortality, and utilization [version 3.0]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRO); 2006 Feb 20. 94 p.

Measure Domain

PRIMARY MEASURE DOMAIN

Use of Services

The validity of measures depends on how they are built. By examining the key building blocks of a measure, you can assess its validity for your purpose. For more information, visit the [Measure Validity](#) page.

SECONDARY MEASURE DOMAIN

Does not apply to this measure

Brief Abstract

DESCRIPTION

This measure is used to assess the number of coronary artery bypass grafts (CABGs) per 100,000 population.

RATIONALE

Coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) is performed on patients with coronary artery disease. No ideal rate for CABG has been established. CABG is a potentially overused procedure, although several studies have noted that CABG is not often performed for inappropriate indications (under 15%).

As an area utilization indicator, CABG is a proxy for actual quality problems. This indicator in particular has unclear construct validity, because CABG does not appear to be performed inappropriately often. Caution should be maintained for CABG rates that are drastically below or above the average or recommended rates.

PRIMARY CLINICAL COMPONENT

Coronary artery disease; coronary artery bypass graft (CABG)

DENOMINATOR DESCRIPTION

Population of county or Metro Area associated with Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) code of patient's residence or hospital location, age 40 years or older

NUMERATOR DESCRIPTION

Number of coronary artery bypass grafts (CABGs)* in any procedure field among patients age 40 years or older. Exclude Major Diagnostic Category (MDC) 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, and puerperium) and MDC 15 (newborns and other neonates).

*Refer to the Technical Specifications document in the "Companion Documents" field for International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) codes and Diagnosis-related Groups (DRGs).

Evidence Supporting the Measure

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE VALUE OF MONITORING USE OF SERVICE

- One or more research studies published in a National Library of Medicine (NLM) indexed, peer-reviewed journal

Evidence Supporting Need for the Measure

NEED FOR THE MEASURE

Monitoring and planning
Variation in use of service

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING NEED FOR THE MEASURE

AHRQ quality indicators. Guide to inpatient quality indicators: quality of care in hospitals -- volume, mortality, and utilization [version 3.0]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 94 p.

State of Use of the Measure

STATE OF USE

Current routine use

CURRENT USE

External oversight/State government program
Monitoring and planning

Application of Measure in its Current Use

CARE SETTING

Hospitals

PROFESSIONALS RESPONSIBLE FOR HEALTH CARE

Physicians
Public Health Professionals

LOWEST LEVEL OF HEALTH CARE DELIVERY ADDRESSED

Counties or Cities

TARGET POPULATION AGE

Age greater than or equal to 40 years

TARGET POPULATION GENDER

Either male or female

STRATIFICATION BY VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Unspecified

Characteristics of the Primary Clinical Component

INCIDENCE/PREVALENCE

In a follow-up to a New York appropriateness study, a panel of cardiologists found a rate of inappropriate procedure of 6% and a rate of uncertain procedures of 12%. In another study of 12 hospitals, the rate of coronary artery bypass graft (CABG) for inappropriate indications ranged from 0% to 5% across hospitals, and the rate of CABG for uncertain indications ranged from 5% to 8%.

EVIDENCE FOR INCIDENCE/PREVALENCE

Leape LL, Hilborne LH, Schwartz JS, Bates DW, Rubin HR, Slavin P, Park RE, Witter DM Jr, Panzer RJ, Brook RH. The appropriateness of coronary artery bypass graft surgery in academic medical centers. Working Group of the Appropriateness Project of the Academic Medical Center Consortium. Ann Intern Med 1996 Jul 1;125(1):8-18. [PubMed](#)

Leape LL, Park RE, Bashore TM, Harrison JK, Davidson CJ, Brook RH. Effect of variability in the interpretation of coronary angiograms on the appropriateness of use of coronary revascularization procedures. Am Heart J 2000 Jan; 139(1 Pt 1): 106-13. [PubMed](#)

ASSOCIATION WITH VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Unspecified

BURDEN OF ILLNESS

Unspecified

UTILIZATION

Unspecified

COSTS

Unspecified

Institute of Medicine National Healthcare Quality Report Categories

IOM CARE NEED

Not within an IOM Care Need

IOM DOMAIN

Not within an IOM Domain

Data Collection for the Measure

CASE FINDING

Both users and nonusers of care

DESCRIPTION OF CASE FINDING

Population of county or Metro Area associated with Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) code of patient's residence or hospital location, age 40 years or older

DENOMINATOR SAMPLING FRAME

Geographically defined

DENOMINATOR INCLUSIONS/EXCLUSIONS

Inclusions

Population of county or Metro Area associated with Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) code of patient's residence or hospital location, age 40 years or older

Exclusions

Unspecified

RELATIONSHIP OF DENOMINATOR TO NUMERATOR

All cases in the denominator are not equally eligible to appear in the numerator

DENOMINATOR (INDEX) EVENT

Patient Characteristic

DENOMINATOR TIME WINDOW

Time window is a single point in time

NUMERATOR INCLUSIONS/EXCLUSIONS

Inclusions

Number of coronary artery bypass grafts (CABGs)* in any procedure field among patients age 40 years or older.

*Refer to the Technical Specifications document in the "Companion Documents" field for International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) codes and Diagnosis-related Groups (DRGs).

Exclusions

Exclude Major Diagnostic Category (MDC) 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, and puerperium) and MDC 15 (newborns and other neonates).

MEASURE RESULTS UNDER CONTROL OF HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS, ORGANIZATIONS AND/OR POLICYMAKERS

The measure results are somewhat or substantially under the control of the health care professionals, organizations and/or policymakers to whom the measure applies.

NUMERATOR TIME WINDOW

Institutionalization

DATA SOURCE

Administrative data

LEVEL OF DETERMINATION OF QUALITY

Does not apply to this measure

PRE-EXISTING INSTRUMENT USED

Unspecified

Computation of the Measure

SCORING

Rate

INTERPRETATION OF SCORE

Undetermined

ALLOWANCE FOR PATIENT FACTORS

Analysis by subgroup (stratification on patient factors, geographic factors, etc.)

DESCRIPTION OF ALLOWANCE FOR PATIENT FACTORS

Observed (raw) rates may be stratified by areas (Metro Area or counties), age groups, race/ethnicity categories, and sex.

Risk adjustment of the data is recommended using, at minimum, age and sex.

Application of multivariate signal extraction (MSX) to smooth risk adjusted rates is also recommended.

STANDARD OF COMPARISON

External comparison at a point in time

External comparison of time trends

Internal time comparison

Evaluation of Measure Properties

EXTENT OF MEASURE TESTING

Each potential quality indicator was evaluated against the following six criteria, which were considered essential for determining the reliability and validity of a quality indicator: face validity, precision, minimum bias, construct validity, fosters real quality improvement, and application. The project team searched Medline for articles relating to each of these six areas of evaluation. Additionally, extensive empirical testing of all potential indicators was conducted using the 1995-97 Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) State Inpatient Databases (SID) and Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS) to determine precision, bias, and construct validity. Table 2 in the original measure documentation summarizes the

results of the literature review and empirical evaluations on the Inpatient Quality Indicators. Refer to the original measure documentation for details.

EVIDENCE FOR RELIABILITY/VALIDITY TESTING

AHRQ quality indicators. Guide to inpatient quality indicators: quality of care in hospitals -- volume, mortality, and utilization [version 3.0]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 94 p.

Identifying Information

ORIGINAL TITLE

Coronary artery bypass graft area rate (IQI 26).

MEASURE COLLECTION

[Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\) Quality Indicators](#)

MEASURE SET NAME

[Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\) Inpatient Quality Indicators](#)

DEVELOPER

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

ADAPTATION

The hospital-based rate of CABG was included in the original Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project Quality Indicator (HCUP QI) set.

PARENT MEASURE

Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality)

RELEASE DATE

2002 Jun

REVISION DATE

2006 Feb

MEASURE STATUS

This is the current release of the measure.

SOURCE(S)

AHRQ quality indicators. Guide to inpatient quality indicators: quality of care in hospitals -- volume, mortality, and utilization [version 3.0]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 94 p.

MEASURE AVAILABILITY

The individual measure, "Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Area Rate (IQI 26)," is published in "AHRQ Quality Indicators. Guide to Inpatient Quality Indicators: Quality of Care in Hospitals -- Volume, Mortality, and Utilization." This document is available in [Portable Document Format \(PDF\)](#) from the [Inpatient Quality Indicators Download](#) page at the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Quality Indicators Web site.

For more information, please contact the QI Support Team at support@qualityindicators.ahrq.gov.

COMPANION DOCUMENTS

The following are available:

- AHRQ quality indicators. Inpatient quality indicators: technical specifications [version 3.0]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 34 p. This document is available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\) Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- AHRQ quality indicators. Inpatient quality indicators: software documentation [version 3] - SPSS. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 40 p. (AHRQ Pub.; no. 02-R208). This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- AHRQ quality indicators. Inpatient quality indicators: software documentation [version 3] - SAS. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 45 p. (AHRQ Pub.; no. 02-R208). This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- AHRQ quality indicators. Software documentation: Windows [version 3.0]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2006 Feb 20. 72 p. This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- Remus D, Fraser I. Guidance for using the AHRQ quality indicators for hospital-level public reporting or payment. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2004 Aug. 24 p. This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- AHRQ summary statement on comparative hospital public reporting. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2005 Dec. 1 p. This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- Guidance for using the AHRQ quality indicators for public reporting or payment - appendix A: current uses of AHRQ quality indicators and considerations for hospital-level reporting. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2005 Dec. A1-13 p. This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).

- Guidance for using the AHRQ quality indicators for public reporting or payment - appendix B: public reporting evaluation framework--comparison of recommended evaluation criteria in five existing national frameworks. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2005 Dec. B1-4 p. This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- AHRQ inpatient quality indicators - interpretive guide. Irving (TX): Dallas-Fort Worth Hospital Council Data Initiative; 2002 Aug 1. 9 p. This guide helps you to understand and interpret the results derived from the application of the Inpatient Quality Indicators software to your own data and is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- UCSF-Stanford Evidence-based Practice Center. Davies GM, Geppert J, McClellan M, et al. Refinement of the HCUP quality indicators. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2001 May. (Technical review; no. 4). This document is available in PDF from the [AHRQ Quality Indicators Web site](#).
- HCUPnet, Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. [internet]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ); 2004 [Various pagings]. HCUPnet is available from the [AHRQ Web site](#).

NQMC STATUS

This NQMC summary was completed by ECRI on February 3, 2006. The information was verified by the measure developer on March 6, 2006.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

No copyright restrictions apply.

© 2006 National Quality Measures Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 9/25/2006

FIRSTGOV

